



**City of Seattle**  
**Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections**  
**Land Use Review**

---

HUGH SCHAEFFER  
1122 E PIKE ST, SUITE 1337  
SEATTLE, WA 98122

Re: Project #3036083-EG

### **Correction Notice #1**

**Review Type** EDG REVIEW  
**Project Address** 12328 33RD AVE NE  
SEATTLE, WA 98125  
**Contact Email** HUGH@S-HW.COM  
**SDCI Reviewer** David Sachs  
**Reviewer Phone** (206) 684-0814  
**Reviewer Email** David.Sachs@seattle.gov  
**Owner** Sound Real Estate Development LLC

**Date** July 10, 2020  
**Contact Phone** (206) 329-1802

**Address** Seattle Department of Construction and  
Inspections  
700 Fifth Ave  
Suite 2000  
P.O. Box 34019  
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

The following corrections are based on the review of your EDG Packet dated June 26, 2020.

### **Applicant Instructions**

**You will not be able to upload corrected plans until all reviews are completed and the project's review status is "Corrections Required".**

\*\*\* Respond by providing **a written response to each correction AND identify changes to drawings since initial review.** \*\*\*

Drawings shall be **legible**, with sheets **oriented correctly**, on an appropriate **sheet size**, with all revisions/changes **clouded or circled**, with **no missing sheets**, and uploaded in a **single PDF file**.

Link for detailed steps: ["How to Respond to a Correction Notice"](#). If the 3-step process outlined in this document is not followed, your response could be **rejected**, permit issuance could be **delayed**, and **penalty fees** could be assessed.

### **Corrections**

1. Remove 'DRAFT' from the cover page and the footer.
2. The examples of recent and proposed projects on page 7 of 33 only include contemporary flat roof projects.

Provide context analysis that also includes existing structures of a similar size near the project site. Use this to explain roof forms and other elements that you are using as influences or for justification in the choice of roof form in your design.

**3.** Although the three options shown on page 13 of 33 are different in plan, the massing appears to be quite similar with only minor differences in modulation. provide 3 distinctly different options.

Understanding the narrowness of the site and the impact of exceptional tree, options to differentiation could include alternative roof form and other solid/void modulation approaches. Is there an option that looks at trimming back the exceptional tree in order to allow for a plan that provides open space and entry to the south rather than the north?

**4.** Per the Packet Checklist (7.0), the Priority Guidelines provided on page 3 of 33 should include the guideline and a description of how the design meets the guideline including diagrams or images to support it.

**5.** Provide a Departure Summary Table per the Packet Checklist (9.0).

Include calculations showing the overall area being requested compared to the allowable FAR.

**6.** It appears that you are proposing basement dwelling units with light wells in all options. Provide information on these light wells including dimensions, sectional information including potential relationship to grade and the property lines. Include images showing successful basement units.

**7.** Submit the Arborist Report as part of EDG. The report should include all trees on site as well as the tree to the north. Include information on health and viability of trimming to 1/3 drip line. Also include information specific to the 28" evergreen and 12, 14" deciduous trees shown on the survey to confirm that they are not exceptional.

**8.** Provide Cons for Option C.

**9.** Indicate the Departure area on all plans. Include dimensions and the SF.